



**You have downloaded a document from  
RE-BUS  
repository of the University of Silesia in Katowice**

**Title:** State of the Art in Psychohistory and Related Fields in Selected Countries of Central and Eastern Europe

**Author:** Virgiliu Birladeanu, Tomasz Pawelec, Volodymyr Vashchenko

**Citation style:** Birladeanu Virgiliu, Pawelec Tomasz, Vashchenko Volodymyr. (2008). State of the Art in Psychohistory and Related Fields in Selected Countries of Central and Eastern Europe. "Interstitio" T. 2, z. 1 (2008), s. 35-46



Uznanie autorstwa - Użycie niekomercyjne - Bez utworów zależnych Polska - Licencja ta zezwala na rozpowszechnianie, przedstawianie i wykonywanie utworu jedynie w celach niekomercyjnych oraz pod warunkiem zachowania go w oryginalnej postaci (nie tworzenia utworów zależnych).



UNIWERSYTET ŚLĄSKI  
W KATOWICACH



Biblioteka  
Uniwersytetu Śląskiego



Ministerstwo Nauki  
i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

## **STATE OF THE ART IN PSYCHOHISTORY AND RELATED FIELDS IN SELECTED COUNTRIES OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE**

**Virgiliu Birlădeanu,**  
**Chişinău, Republic of Moldova**

**Tomasz Pawelec,**  
**Katowice, Poland**

**Volodymyr Vashchenko,**  
**Dniproptetrov'sk, Ukraine**

### **Summary**

*The paper discusses current state of art in psychohistory and related areas of research in selected countries of Central and Eastern Europe. At first a general context of its introduction in the region is provided. Decades of an almost complete absence of psychoanalysis in academic milieu and in psychotherapy in this part of the region (resulting from a hostile attitude of communist regimes toward psychoanalytic ideas) is identified as major element impeding psychohistory's progress there nowadays. The present situation in such countries as Russia, Belarus, Ukraine, Poland, Romania and Moldova is then described in a more detailed way. According to the authors substantial differences with regard to the position of psychohistory in them are noticeable, ranging from hostility and active fight with the discussed trend, through prevalent disregard and indifference to it, to various forms (and stages) of acceptance/assimilation into the mainstream research.*

While discussing the current state of psychohistory in Central and Eastern Europe, one can not escape some reflections on uneasy conditions of the existence and the development of psychoanalysis in the region. These have resulted from history; more precisely, they are directly connected with the consequences of the WW II and the tragedy of communism in the life of countries and nations from this part of European continent. As for the latter issue, in communist Soviet Union, after the short period of free development (to the end of 1920s), psychoanalysis was banned as a false and reactionary bourgeois pseudoscience. When, after the WW II the Soviet sphere of domination extended to embrace the whole eastern part of the continent, this ban has become obligatory in all vassal countries of the communist superpower.

It is worth noting here that earlier (i.e. during the mid-war period) psychoanalysis had noted significant developments in some of them (e.g. in Hungary and Poland) and enjoyed a measure of influence in the area of psychiatry and medicine, as well as in the fields of literature and humanities. The war brought destruction to the movement and wiped out local communities of psychoanalysts. Many – especially those of Jewish origin – were killed by Nazi Germans, others emigrated. Given unfavorable post-war political conditions, few survivors could not even dream about the revival of the movement. So, for several decades the existence of psychoanalysis “behind the Iron Curtain” has become reduced into half legal activities of single enthusiasts who individually arranged their training in one or another neighboring countries of the Free World and then tried to do their private practice at home (there were some cases of informal training at home country and practice without certificates, as well).

Clearly, this absence of psychoanalysis in psychotherapy and psychology was accompanied with (and/or resulted in) parallel absence of psychoanalytic thought in art and literature as well as in social sciences and humanities. Translations of Freud’s writing were delayed at least to late 1960s, they were selective and infrequent. Writings and ideas of other major analytic thinkers were for the most unknown and inaccessible.

Slow and gradual changes become visible during the last and declining phase of communist regime. Psychoanalytic views and ideas have emerged in some branches of humanities (at first, in the area of literary studies); a room for doing clinical practice has been broadened, as well. These new developments notwithstanding, the general picture was unchanged in the beginning of 1990s: on the eve of the new epoch, psychoanalysis was essentially absent in societal life of post-communist countries. It was a great difference from the situation in the West where almost “intrusive” presence of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy in the every day life of numerous people was giving a “therapeutic flavor” to many aspects of culture while psychoanalytic inspirations were stimulating dynamics and directions of development in art as well as in many human sciences.

Therefore, despite some efforts at binding with local more or less distant tradition, psychoanalytic movement and, naturally, other undertakings related to it (such as psychohistory) should be perceived as “external imports” offered

to communities which up to now have essentially been doing without them and in some measure have even been unprepared for their introduction. What are the results of such unprepared encounter in case of psychohistory? Before some concrete finding and observations would be presented, let us briefly discuss dynamics that could develop here.

Obviously, the introduction of so strikingly unusual approach must result in a kind of intellectual shock within the community of scholars exposed to it. The scale of this shock may vary in relation to the relative suddenness of the exposure (extended preliminary contacts, even of mediocre scale, would reduce it). Further reactions depend on various factors that could be presented within such dimensions as: intellectual homogeneity vs. theoretical and methodological pluralism within the community of scholars; the level of self confidence in the inherited approaches and research strategies; organizational and ideological stability vs. turmoil and the search for new options/solutions; societal/political tasks of historians and social scientists as defined by themselves and by the ruling elite; a degree of the openness for the modernizing ideas from the West (including general advances already made by deep psychology in a given society).

Different combinations of these factors would result in diversity of situations in which psychohistory finds itself in various countries of the region nowadays. Although this essay can not cover all of them, it nevertheless presents the full spectrum of possible outcomes ranging from hostility and active fight with psychohistory, through prevalent disregard and indifference to it, to various forms (and stages) of acceptance/assimilation into the mainstream research.

## **Differentiated ways of psychohistory in post-Soviet space: Russia, Belarus, Ukraine**

### **1. Russia: "incest with the state power"**

The difficulty of studying the genesis of psychohistory in post-Soviet space lies in the fact that process of its institutionalization has not been terminated, as yet and even the main lines of it are not necessary clear. Suggestions to discuss the issue within the context of general advances of depth psychology in the region (D. Rancour-Lafargue, 'Observations on Psychoanalysis in Contemporary Russia', *Clio's Psyche* Vol. 13 no. 4) are correct as tempestuous development of psychoanalysis which has become quite fashionable in Russia of 1990s was indeed accompanied with awakening interests in psychohistory. The key events, which marked the emergence of psychohistory between other recognized scholarly disciplines were (1) the edict issued by the President of Russia B. Eltsin on supporting the development of psychoanalysis in Russia (1996); (2) Russian edition of L. deMause's major book *Foundations of Psychohistory* (2000).

As for the former, this "incest of psychoanalysis with state power" initiated by the President resulted in making psychohistory a respectable discipline

safely located in the sphere of loyal scholarly activity in Russia. As for the latter, the monograph by deMause remains the basic source book on psychohistory for post-Soviet intellectuals.

Today the geography of psychohistory's presence in Russia includes the central areas (Moscow and Saint Petersburg) as well as some university cities on the East (Tomsk), and on the West of the country (Voronezh). The leading historians within the field are I. Y. Nikolaeva (Tomsk State University) and M. V. Kirchanov (Voronezh State University).

An institution which pioneered in injecting psychohistorical approach in the former USSR was Tomsk State University. It was connected with methodological studies on contemporary historiography developed by B. Mogilinicky and his co-workers (B. G. Mogilicky, I. Y. Nikolaeva, G. K. Gulbing, *American Bourgeois "Psychohistory": Critical Essay*, Tomsk 1985). Understandably, at Soviet time a penetration of psychohistory into community of Soviet historians could occur only under the "sauce" of "fight" with bourgeois history. The way of its legal disciplinary penetration was "historical psychology". As already noted, the most active scholar was one of B. Mogilinicky's disciples - Nikolaeva; majority of her overview articles appeared in the first half of 1980s. She wrote on American psychohistory as a whole, as well as on particular concepts of its prominent representatives, particularly E. Erikson. However, it was an issue of psychohistorical interpretations of social revolutions that was taking up most of her attention. Also, at the end of 1980s some generalizing papers by L. Suhotina appeared; those were dedicated to analysis of psychohistorical interpretations of Russian revolutionary movements. Simultaneously, (i.e. through 1980s) a more broad process of penetration of Freudian theories into USSR was going on: some authors attempted at quite penetrating analyses of Freud's teaching offered in disguise of a criticism of different sides of "freudism", as, for instance, M.A. Popova in her monograph *Freudism and religion* (1985).

Generally the works mentioned above have initiated to shape the image of psychohistory as scientific discipline, forming characteristics of which included:

1. Multidisciplinary nature - a trend to integration with the other disciplines;
2. Presence of its own unique methods;
3. Anti-marxist views as opposition of individual (the psycho-oriented) to collective (sociologically-oriented);
4. The speculative nature of theory.

Nowadays psychohistory in Russia develops within the borders of two disciplines - history and political science. Social, cultural and political situation in Russia (war in Caucasus region, so-called "moslem factor") compels attention of political scientists-psychohistorians to study the psychological sources of terrorism. These advances are reflected in the area of higher education. First department of political psychology in Russia was established in 1990 for A.

I. Yuriev (the author of monographs *Introduction into Political Psychology* and *System Description of Political Psychology*) at St.-Petersburg State University. Currently Faculty of Psychology of this university offers (the instructor is T. P. Elohina) a course for M.A. students entitled "Psychobiography of a political leader" (68 teaching hours). Participants are familiarized with concepts of Freud, Erikson and Fromm there and the list of topics include "Psychohistorical context of psychobiography".

Evidently, it is psychobiography which development goes at the quickest rate: given conditions of competitive political ambience and constant change it has turned out to be an efficient instrument in fight for state power. Therefore historians put their interest on "deviant" political leaders from the past, such as tsar Ivan Grozny ("The Awesome") and J. Stalin.

It should be added that there is a peculiar "negative motivation" present behind the development of psychohistory in Russia: namely the intention to safeguard the national (i.e. imperial) historical metanarrative from corrosion caused by some psychohistorians from the West. In other words, there is an urge to respond to American and European authors devoted to Russia history who express their views and interpretations "through" the genre of psychohistory.

## **2. Belarus: "this is psychohistory!"**

The emergence of psychohistory in Belarus is related with the activity of two historians from capital city (Minsk) O. M. Shutova and V. N. Sidortsov, who truly could be named "apostles of psychohistorical revolution". The crucial moment came in 1997 when Shutova (she previously had spent some time in the USA and was trained within the circle of L. deMause's followers) has defended her candidate's (i.e. doctoral) thesis then published as a monograph *Psychohistory: school and methods*. Major step in psychohistory's institutionalization followed then – the introduction of the separate course on psychohistory in historical department of Belarus State University in Minsk. At the same time, under direction of Sidortsov, Belarus Psychohistorical Association has been created. It is registered as a local branch of International Psychohistorical Association, and remains oriented toward deMause's model of psychohistory. Currently scholars from capital – such as D. S. Samohvalov, A. A. Torkanovsky or P. V. Markevich – dominate the community of Belarussian psychohistorians. Their research interests focus on psychological background of terrorism, psychobiographies of leading persons, as well as collective portraits of Belarussian peasantry. It has become a rule at Belarus State University that international conferences organized there usually host a panel on (or referring to) psychohistory. Thus, during the latest methodological conference "XXI age: actual problems of the historical scholarship", texts of patriarchs of psychohistory – J. Atlas and L. deMause – were presented at special psychohistorical section; it could be interpreted as an indicator of deep immersion of Belarussian intellectuals in the international world of psychohistory.

During the last ten years the intensively debated idea of psychohistory has

done the rash quarry in Belarus historical community, with the term itself having enough time to change into a fashionable metaphor symbolizing progress in historical scholarship. Though meantime it has lost some of its novelty and semantic nominal value, it nevertheless has fallen into everyday life of even orthodox historians. A traditional historian A. Zapartyko, the director of Belarus State Archive and Museum of Literature and Art, evaluating the wealth of the archival records and the ability of particular sources to reflect adequately some emotional and societal trends of a given epoch, has expressed it very clearly exclaiming: "This is psychohistory!" ('A Ticket Which Price is Epoch', *Soviet Belarus*, 2006, April, 8<sup>th</sup>).

The list of key features of today Belarusian psychohistory include:

1. Centralization: scholarly potential remains concentrated in capital (at Belarus State University and Minsk Institute of Management) while history is taught at seven universities thorough the country;
2. A close entanglement of psychohistorical studies with computer technologies as used in history (so called "cliometrics"): many Belarussian psychohistorians, including the head of Belarussian psychohistorical association Sidortsov, are active members of international association "History and Computer";
3. Theoretical insufficiency: an orientation toward the model of psychohistory, offered by deMause in his *Foundations of Psychohistory*;
4. The departure of the "apostles of psychohistorical revolution" (first of all Shutova) from the field to, among others, so called "gender project".

### **3. Ukraine: "one hundred years without S. Freud"**

Particularly misty and open in its vagueness are the prospects of psychohistory in Ukraine. Evidently, these result from the marginal state of psychoanalysis in Ukrainian intellectual community. A literary critic, a philosopher and a translator S. Pavlychko, who attempted to trace the ways of psychoanalytical discourse in Ukraine during the entire 20<sup>th</sup> century, has concluded uncourageously: "Freud's psychoanalysis, afterwards K. Jung's analytical psychology, then Lacan's adaptation of S. Freud to French intellectual milieu, phenomenological and structuralist polemics with S. Freud, as well as its combination with various ways of analysis of culture – all of these have occurred without Ukrainian intellectual participation" ('One Hundred Years Without Freud', in: Pavlychko, *Theory of Literature*, Osnovy, 2006, p. 565). Editors of the study *History of Psychoanalysis in Ukraine* (1996) have noted however, that psychobiography did enjoy a sort of a very short "golden age" there in 1920s. That time V. Domontovich (Ber) wrote first psychobiographies of prominent Ukrainian historians M. Kostomarov and P. Kulish with special emphasis on their sexual life.

In the very few cases when nowadays a psychohistorical study appears in the country it is met with hostility. The majority of academic historians react with awe and unprovoked aggression. Such desolate situation is conditioned

by the incompleteness of the Ukrainian modernistic project and, especially, by problems with establishing a national metanarrative for young Ukrainian state. Unlike in Belarus, where efforts toward forming such a metanarrative have been stopped (or "frozen") after the proclamation of "the friendship with Russia" on a state level, and in Russia, where the domination of imperial historiographical canon has never been subjected to serious doubts, the majority of Ukrainian modern historians define their fundamental professional task exactly in terms of formation of national historical metanarrative. From that point of view "techniques of psychohistory", with their potential for deconstruction of national myths, are seen as a threat.

A review discussing psychobiographical studies of V. Vaschenko (focused on M. Grushevs'ky – 20<sup>th</sup> century most eminent Ukrainian historian and major builder of Ukrainian national metanarrative), written by an orthodox historian I. Hyrych for the weekly periodical noted for its liberal and pro-Western views, would serve as an instructive example. With its expressive title 'Attention, the neo Freudians go!' the text remains within the worst traditions of the Soviet ideological discourse (*Mirror of the Week*, 2006, no. 50, December, 11-17<sup>th</sup>).

Contrary to countries mentioned above, neither institutionalization of psychohistory as a discipline, nor its theoretical unification has occurred in Ukraine. There are just individual initiatives of a few enthusiasts, who practice it within the areas history, political science and literary studies. The relative advantage of such "amorphous" situations is pluralism and proliferation of psychohistorical concepts: each scholar forms up exactly his own variant of psychohistory, building the pyramid from theoretical "downs" to empirical "ups" by him/herself. The result is the development of originally conceived psychohistorical theories, which are not necessarily just "inventions of the bicycle" well-known in the West.

Therefore, in 2003 V. A. Morgun has defended a doctoral dissertation in history entitled *Public-Political Problems of Building a Civil Society in Independent Ukraine* at Donetsk National University. The author himself has observed: "It is the first time when a psychohistorical approach based on author's theory of 'balanced biopsychosociogenesis' has been put forward in Ukraine to analyze the public problem". The theory itself has been formulated by Morgun in a fundamental paper 'Civil Society in the Context of Typologies of Psychohistory of Mankind' (*Science, Religion, Society* 2003, no. 1). Unfortunately, it is hardly possible to find other projects which attempt to explore the heuristic and prognostic potentials of psychohistory with relation to dynamics of contemporary Ukrainian society.

As for literary studies one may mention N. Zborovska's project of psychohistory of modern Ukrainian literature, where various psychoanalytical concepts, as well as the author's own model of "metaphysical analysis" are in use (*Code of Ukrainian Literature. The Project of Psychohistory of the Latest Ukrainian Literature*, Ky'iv 2006) as well as psychobiographical studies of S. Pavlychko (dealing with creative legacy of Ukrainian historian A. Kryms'ky) and G. Grabovich who scrutinized M. Hvylovoj's symbolic biography.



Eventually, in the field of history a contribution made by some representatives of so called "Dnipropetrovs'k historiographical school" should be mentioned, especially O. A. Udod's studies on historical sources where theory of "cognitive dissonance" has been applied ('Psychohistorical Approach to History Source', *Bulletin of Dnipropetrovs'k University. History and Archeology* 2000, no. 8). Quite separately in Ukrainian historiography stands V. V. Vaschenko's with his psychobiographical studies mentioned above. Using theoretical concepts of narrative psychology, gestalt psychology and social constructivism, he has developed the idea of "ontopsychospatium" for studying various models of historical writings ('Meditations around the Possibilities of Study Onto-psychotopos in Ukrainian Historiography: case of M. Grushevsky', *Eidos. Almanac to theory and history of historiography* 2005 no. 1).

### **Poland: constant possibility that has not become reality**

During communism (especially after 1956) a community of Polish historians was able to maintain intellectual as well as organizational links with historiography in the West to much greater extent than their less fortunate colleagues from other countries of the Soviet bloc. Therefore as early as in 1960/70s some psychohistorical writings were noted; first reports and attempts at (very cautionary) analysis of the phenomenon followed soon. This reception was basically a negative one, the scholarly value of the new approach was questioned, as well as reasons for its possible implementation within historical scholarship in Poland. On a surface level it was an expression of strong attachments of Polish historians to previously adopted approaches and paradigms of history (be them traditional, Marxist or borrowed from *Annales* school). However, more basic reason that laid behind was a complete lack of preparation to absorb psychoanalytic thought inherent in psychohistory – an obvious consequence of many years of the absence of psychoanalysis in the country. In essence, the same could be said about the parallel contacts of some Polish political scientists with psychohistorical thought that begun at the same time (although the general atmosphere was a bit more favorable there).

Although in 1980s there were some attempts at more balanced (and more kind) treatment of psychohistory (mainly by A. F. Grabski, then the leading expert on current "state of the art" in history), it were 1990s that brought major changes. A series of historiographical overviews and deeper methodological analyses of psychohistorical approach appeared that provided Polish historians and social scientists with thorough knowledge on the subject. The majority of these papers was written by T. Ochowski – a psychologist from Warsaw University – and T. Pawelec – a historian from University of Silesia in Katowice; the latter has crowned his studies with a book-length treatise on the development and the methodology of psychohistory as well as with a volume of translations of selected papers written by some major American scholars in the field.

Accordingly, the gate was open but these new possibilities for the emergence of psychohistory in the country has hardly turned into realities – especially among professional (academic) historians and despite the fact that Polish

branch of IPA has been formally existing for quite a few years. Psychohistory does have the place within current curricula for historical studies but a very minor one. For the most, it is discussed within the frames of courses on history of historiography and/or those overviewing methods of historical research. Also, there have been few cases when classes on psychology (present in the curriculum if graduates are supposed to become schoolteachers in history) were partially turned into a course on psychohistory. On the other hand, it is very hard to list original research initiatives within the field that would be launched by Polish historians. It seems that these few of them who do care about a psychological dimension of history are content with methodology developed by the history of mentality.

Fortunately, some interesting initiatives has emerged on a vaguely defined (and for very this reason fertile) "borderland area" between history and psychology. Especially, one may mention T. Ochiniowski's study of the experience of political prisoners in Poland during the Stalin era. This project – aimed also at the development of methodology for similar studies on a comparative and international level – was grounded, among others, in the approach of R. Lifton and provided the author with a doctoral degree in psychology (2000). Currently such studies have been renewed on a broader scale as a collective enterprise that include a participation of history and psychology students in a research team, as well. Also, psychohistorical perspective remains at work in other projects initiated or co-initiated by the scholar mentioned above which deal with state-Catholic Church relations in Poland of 1950s and – an area very distinct from history – techniques of stress management in contemporary corporate environments.

Psychologists did play an important role in establishing psychohistory as a legitimate scholarly enterprise in Poland. One may note that some of them authored a series of reviews of psychohistorical books currently being published in the West that appeared in historical (sic!) journals in late 1980s; they have also initiated a Polish edition of W. M. Runyan's *Life Histories and Psychobiography* in early 1990s. However, a potential for their future contribution remains limited because of the fact that it is cognitive psychology that dominate the mainstream academic psychology in the country. That results in the prevalence of attitudes of hostility and distrust toward psychoanalytic thought there.

The most important is the fact that the above refers also to (rather tiny) circle of psychologists who advocate and attempt research that combine problems of psychology with those of history and politics. Their program of so called historical psychology (M. Dymkowski, a psychologist from Wrocław and the author of such treatises as *An Introduction into Historical Psychology*, Gdansk 2003 and *Between Psychology and History*, Warsaw 2000, remains the leader of that circle) programmatically opposes the methodology of psychoanalytic psychohistory and questions scholarly value of most of its achievements to date. Even if works published there do sometimes have the term "psychohistory" within the title (as W. Jakubowski, *Polish Peasants 1944-1948: A Psychohistorical Perspective*, Warsaw 2000) their content really do not resemble

psychohistory as it is usually practiced.

The situation in the area of political psychology is basically the same. Naturally, scholars are now well aware of the fundamental value of psychoanalytic ideas and insights for that field of study – but during early, pioneering phases of its development. For them it is a classical (i.e. rather closed) period. In this context a psychohistorical session that took place during the convention of International Society of Political Psychology held in Cracow (1997) has remained an occasional event without continuation.

Generally then the attitude of reticence (to say the least) toward the challenge of psychohistory that prevails among historians and the social scientists remains clearly visible. It is even more significant in the context of almost completed full-scale restoration of psychoanalysis in Poland (including the dissemination of psychoanalytic therapy, the establishment of professional associations of psychoanalysts of various persuasions, numerous publications ranging from translations of major works to current production of both clinical papers and pieces in applied psychoanalysis) and its unquestionable advances in such areas as literary and gender studies as well as within the philosophical discourse.

It is worth of noticing however, that psychohistorical insights and inspirations have been able to spread in other environments than those linked with Academia. This refers to some independent and non-profit groups or associations which oppose child abuse and sexual molestation and/or provide support for victims (also adult victims) of such offenses. The case of the Association “Stop Silencing” is particularly instructive. It disseminates - mainly through the Internet - papers on the subject (translated into Polish) that originated within the psychohistorical community, especially those by L. deMause and A. Miller.

### **Romania and the Republic of Moldova: the case of warm reception?**

Despite the fact that precursors' studies in the field were instantly translated and published in Romania, a distinct tradition of psychohistory as a separate undertaking has not been inaugurated in Romania and the Republic of Moldova yet. However, its topics and methods do have appeal in scholarly milieus of bordering disciplines: social psychology, age psychology, historical anthropology, literary history, etc. Developments in these fields have created tangential areas and interests, thus a room for psychohistorical research has been opened, as well.

Therefore, within the academic milieu flexible toward innovations first circles of scholars have been generated. Such initiatives as launching the review periodical *Caietele Echinox* edited by Corin Braga and the emergence of “Eranos” circle led by Ștefan Borbély (the head of Romanian Branch of IPA and the author of, among others, the studies ‘A Psychohistorical Insight into Past and Present Romania’, in *New Europe College Yearbook 1996-1997*, Bucharest, 2000, and ‘Psychohistorical Perspectives on the Holocaust and Communist Totalitarianism’, in *Caietele Echinox*, nr. 13, 2007) have paved the way

to the foundation of "Imaginary Research Centre" within the Faculty of Letters, University "Babeş-Bolyai" in Cluj-Napoca, Romania. The horizon of its studies and publications embraced diverse topics, for instance myth and rite in the conception of Freud, Oedipus – a Jungian myth analysis, Jung and Archetypology, rites of lustration, sacrificial rites in Old Testament, trauma of birth in the conception of psychohistory. Here we attest the first clear articulation of psychohistorical (and psychohistorically informed) research.

One needs to mention the contribution made by Faculty of History of that University, as well. Within the "Historical Anthropology Seminar" that has been established there under direction of Toader Nicoară research is conducted in such areas as: men and death, kinship, family; food, habitat, cloth, vogue; collective sensibilities and social imaginary, ecological history (epidemics, natural calamities). Results usually appear in *Issues in Historical Anthropology*, a periodical dedicated to present major research topics of the Seminar. The list of latest monographs with some psychohistorical "flavor" published by leading members of the Seminar include: Toader Nicoară, *The Sentiment of Insecurity in Romanian Society from the Beginning of Modern Period (1600-1830)*; Simona Nicoară, *A History of Secularization*; Marius Rotar, *The Death in Transylvania in 19<sup>th</sup> Century*; Luminița Dumănescu, *Transylvania of Child. Demographic Dimension of Childhood at the Romanians from Ardeal (1857-1910)*.

The influence of psychohistorical ideas is noticeable at University of Bucharest, as well. Its Faculty of History hosts "The Centre of History of Imaginary" tutored by Lucian Boia. Collaborators of the Centre, frequently applying Jungian method of studying archetypes, deal for the most with the history of ideas and mentalities, historical and political mythologies, as well as issues of identity and alterity. De-mystification and de-mythologization of historical discourse undertaken by Boia in a series of treatises (such as, among others *For a History of Imaginary*, Bucharest 1998 and *Two centuries of national mythology*, Bucharest 2002), has provoked hot debates both within the community of professional historians and in mass-media.

The history of mentalities and imaginary, in vogue in 1980s and 1990s, has generated a plethora of studies which often refer to the insights of psychohistory in Romania and in the Republic of Moldova. As for Romania, one needs to mention contribution made by such scholars as Daniel Barbu, Constantin Bărbulescu, Alexandru-Florin Platon, Mihaela Grancea. As for Moldova, the investigations of this kind are practiced within the frame of "Rethinking History Center" of the Institute of History and Political Sciences at the Free International University from Moldova led by Virgiliu Bîrlădeanu from Institute of History and Political Sciences at the Free International University from Moldova. The list of scholars most involved includes Lilia Zabolotnaia and Alina Felea from Academy of Sciences of Moldova, and Angela Lisnic from „Ion Creangă” State Pedagogical University.

### **Concluding remarks**

Today the presence of psychohistory in Central and Eastern Europe is an unquestioned fact. Those who perceived it as a specifically Western undertaking that would be incompatible with intellectual atmosphere as well as cultural and scholarly tradition of the region were surely wrong. The scale and range of this presence can not satisfy advocates of the approach, however. Yet, the situation remains quite fluent. Local differences notwithstanding, one may safely assume that psychohistory has still the potential for further growth there, especially in these countries where up to now her advances were relatively modest.

<sup>i</sup> Titles of publications and periodicals in local languages have been translated into English by the authors of this paper.